

**Remarks**

This is a Response to the Official Action dated April 2, 2004.

Claims 1-6 are currently pending in the Application and Claims 7-17 are newly presented herein.

**Claims 1-6**

This response amended Claims 1-6. The amended claims are used to clarify the scope of the invention.

**New Claims**

This response presents new claims 7-17 to broaden the scope of the invention, and these are **not** offered in response to the Examiner's rejections.

Support for new Claims 7-9 can be found in original Claims 2 and 4-5.

Support for new Claims 10-13 can be found in original Claims 1-2 and 4-5 and Figures 1 and 2 of the specification and associated description.

Support for new Claims 14-17 can be found in original Claims 1-6.

**35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection**

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Novoa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,284 B1).

**Claim 1**

The Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Novoa discloses, suggests or teaches, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 1, as amended, of the present application:

“means for representing to a user a plurality of components of a computer platform; means for representing to the user interactions among the plurality of components; and means for allowing the user to modify a security setting associated with at least one of the plurality of components”

Novoa discloses remotely flashing ROM and reconfiguring security settings of a target computer system by forming and delivering a remote flash ROM and security package to the target computer system. (See abstract of Novoa.)

Applicant submits that Novoa does not teach, disclose or suggest “means for representing to a user a plurality of components of a computer platform; means for representing to the user interactions among the plurality of components; and means for allowing the user to modify a security setting associated with at least one of the plurality of components” as claimed in Claim 1. Hence, Claim 1 is patentable over Novoa and should be allowed by the Examiner. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to identify the portion of the Novoa disclosure that explicitly discloses these elements. Claims 2-5, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also believed to be patentable over Novoa.

#### **Claim 6**

The Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Novoa discloses, suggests or teaches, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 6, as amended, of the present application:

“representing to a user a plurality of components of a computer platform; representing to the user interactions among the plurality of components; and allowing the user to modify a security setting associated with at least one of the plurality of components”

Claim 6 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and thus the above discussion is equally applicable. Therefore, Claim 6 is patentable over Novoa and should be allowed by the Examiner. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to identify the portion of the Novoa disclosure

that explicitly discloses these elements. New Claims 7-9, at least based on their dependency on Claim 6, are also believed to be patentable over Novoa.

**Patentability of new Claim 10**

New Claim 10 recites “a memory to store computer-readable code; and a processor operatively coupled to said memory and configured to implement said computer-readable code, said computer-readable code being configured to: represent to a user a plurality of computer components; represent to the user interactions among the plurality of computer components; and allow the user to modify a security setting associated with at least one of the computer components.” Applicant submits that at least these features are not disclosed by Novoa. Support for the new Claim 10 can at least be found in originally submitted Claim 1 and Figures 1 and 2 of the specification and the associated description.

Hence, Claim 10 is patentable and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 11-13, at least based on their dependency on Claim 10, are also believed to be patentable.

**Patentability of new Claim 14**

New Claim 14 recites “depicting a plurality of computer components; depicting interactions among the plurality of computer components; and allowing modification of a security setting associated with at least one of the computer components.” Applicant submits that at least these features are not disclosed by Novoa. Support for the new Claim 14 can at least be found in the originally submitted Claims 1 and 6.

Hence, Claim 14 is patentable and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 15-17, at least based on their dependency on Claim 14, are also believed to be patentable.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

October 4, 2004

(Date of Deposit)

Corinda Humphrey

(Name of Person Signing)




(Signature)

October 4, 2004

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 43,010

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300